

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

MATTHEW ESCALANTE
S.JE. AND S.G.E., Minor Children
Plaintiffs
vs
JANELLE ESCALANTE
CHRISTOPHER T WILSON
LEWANNA BELL LLOYD
Defendants

Case No 2:23-CV02491

**PLAINTIFF OBJECTION TO DOC 55 GUARDIAN AD LITEMS
RESPONSE, SHOULD BE STRICKEN PER ADMINISTRATIVE
RULES AS THE SIGNATURE IS UNAUTHORIZED IN 2:23-CV02491**

To The Honorable John Broomes and Honorable Magistrate Teresa James,

The Plaintiff, in the most respect possible, begs and prays that the Court see the following facts that justify the Defendant Guardian ad Litem Bell-Lloyd's Doc 55 filed on March 15, 2024, should be Stricken from the case record of 2:23-CV02491. The Doc 55, contains an Unauthorized Signature of an Attorney who is not on record of this case nor properly entered any appearance of entry. Plaintiff shows unto the Court :

1. Exhibit 1, Administrative rules of the United States District Court in the District of Kansas. On its Page 11, the following is found PLEADINGS THAT ADD OR DELETE PARTIES OR ATTORNEYS:
 - a. On Page 11, Number 5 - "If, after the initial complaint in a case is filed, a party (in this case the Defendant Bell-Lloyd) files a pleading (doc 55) that adds a new party(attorney James Morrow), the Attorney who files the Pleading SHALL CALL the Clerks office before filing the Pleading to have the new party added to the case in the system"
 - b. CM/ECF information verifies that Rule Number 5 on Page 11, of Administrative Rules did not occur.
 - c. The Undersigned of Doc 55, Missouri Attorney James Christian Morrow is Unauthorized to Electronically File Doc 55 in Case 2:23-CV02491, without first contacting the Clerk of the US Court to be added to Proceeding.
2. Plaintiff father, respectfully, formally objects to Doc 55, as needing to be Stricken entirely as the Signature and document of Attorney James Morrow is Unauthorized.
3. The Plaintiff's Objection also encompasses the statements and Exhibit A that were were placed in Doc 55 upon the further following facts:
 - a. Plaintiff respectfully asked that Rule 60(b) be granted in a Relief from Judgement/Order Doc 50 and 51 entered by the Court on January 31, 2024.
 1. Plaintiff calls to attention the Defendant Bell-Lloyd's misrepresentation of her Exhibit A attached to Unauthorized Doc #55. Exhibit A is a JIMS screenshot of Johnson County case 18-CV03183 containing purportedly a 'proof' of the Guardian's legal presence and/or jurisdiction held in the parties state court proceedings. The Exhibit A is dated 3/13/24. The misrepresentation of that screenshot to this High Court is verified by looking at the purported Respondent's attorney, Edward Bigus.
 2. The exhibit B, from the Plaintiff attached is Case Record of docket of 18-CV03813, on 11/28/23, BY ORDER OF CHIEF JUDGE Edward Bigus was rescinded/removed, in which he gave the Respondent/Court, his withdrawal and yet he is still seen in Exhibit A. Exhibit A is not accurate, and plaintiff feels it inappropriate, and further misrepresentation of the

Defendant Bell-Lloyd to try to flash that screenshot as any support to her claim that she perceives she holds any jurisdiction as Guardian Ad Litem attorney to two Minor Children.

3. As prior stated in Doc 53, the Plaintiff indicated that CASA, Court Appointed Special Advocate representative from Overland Park expressed grave concern to the Plaintiff upon disclosure to the organization. CASA felt helpless as Guardian Bell-Lloyd is not employed by their organization but they directly knew her. She is Guardian ad Litem governed under Rule 110 Standards for Guardian written by the Kansas Supreme Court, and she has making terrible decisions regarding 'best interest' of the two minor plaintiffs. That has directly caused emotional and mental health distress. And the Children, they are innocent. They're just babies.
4. Plaintiff Begs and Prays this Court consider the Merit of which Father brought these defendants before the High Court. They are too remain independent from the Trial Court judge entirely, as he is not a part of this proceeding nor need to be mentioned further, but Plaintiff is respectfully asking for Consideration of Rule 60(b) under the Grounds for Relief stated in Doc 53, but also now further merit for the request to add section (3) Misrepresentation by an Opposing Party, that did just occur a number of times in Doc 55. Respectfully said.
5. As to the Other Defendant Mr Wilson and Ms Escalante, it is regretful and tragic that the Plaintiff shows statements prima facie that further evidence of fraud has been applied by the two just mentioned as Attorney and mother of the children, in the criminal court of Johnson County in case 24-DV00172. There's a problem of misrepresentation occurring by the affidavit and purported witness statements in that case formed against the Plaintiff father. Defendant Mother, just days after dismissed from 2:23-CV02491 on January 31, 2024. The following week, Mother approached or did not approach the Gardner Police Department, in actions consistent with admissible evidence and misrepresented a Court Order Doc 307 from parties civil custody case 18-CV03813 against the Plaintiff father in a form of fraud. An allegation was made that backdated to a purported criminal violation of a children's civil restraining order by the father that doesn't exist nor even able to be criminally charged off of even if it did. That is atrocious misuse of the child as Mother used the oldest child S.J.E, to commit a form of fraud to the GPD in 24-DV00172. She has intentionally misconstrued Doc 307 statutes to move a charge of KSA 21-5907 VIOLATION OF PROT ORDER that is unable to prosecute as the civil order, violated or not violated doesn't even fall subject to KSA 21-5924. This is found and affirmed of the same condition that exist with Escalante vs Escalante as the Kansas Court of Appeals Case of State vs Hendricks. Attached as Exhibit 3, is doc 307 contains page 2 and 3 and it is easily seen the the Civil Court order determined off of Family codes of KSA 23-3203, determinations that were encompassed into a Final Judgement pursuant KSA 60-254. KSA 60-254(b) by given assumption that section (a) of that statute is only a definition.
6. Exhibit 4, State vs Hendricks held, *In fact, certification under K.S.A. 2013 60-254(b) could probably never be done in a divorce case anyway* as the Appellate court goes to show that its a divorce case just like Escalante's

contains many claims in one Divorce setting and the Judgement really actually can't be final. As in the Escalante case and Doc 307, there multiple claims spoke of on October 18, 2023 of child support, parenting time, alleged need or perception of counseling..... and they like all divorces are contained as One Claim and KSA 60-254. And a civil restraining was placed under KSA 60-254 and it needed to be placed under one of the four statutes that are able to be criminally charged under KSA 21-5924 VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDER. The reality of that fraud in 24-DV00172, is the Plaintiff could have contacted the alleged victim, his beautiful baby daughter 1000 times and it is still not able to be contained and prosecuted on a criminal level. And heck no 1000 contacts would not occur. But State vs Hendricks goes onto to Rule that the father of that proceeding was not eligible to receive a criminal and the Appellate had to reverse a crime that never had legal prongs to charge and convict. And If mother 'believes' what she alleges, if she actually believed that then she must pursue a civil contempt charge. But no, mother de-frauded the father plaintiff in 24-DV00172, and his attorney are having to disclose it all right now to the prosecution. And that's not good, for best interest. It's not best interest of anyone to deceive and lie to criminal complaints as mother did. Father has put up with a lot of false claims.

WHEREFORE the Plaintiff begs and prays for Relief of Judgement/Order of Rule 60b to be a request made with merit and NEW FACTS and GROUNDS found under section (2) and (3) Plaintiff never meant an ounce of disrespect to Hon John Broomes or Hon Magistrate James but the Defendants engaged in all the above facts has been victimizing the Plaintiff and children for years and the Plaintiff brought parties here for Relief. And he begs and prays it falls on the hearts of the Honorable's of this proceeding to overlook any perception of plaintiff that may be misconstrued or projected different as this has all been very traumatic for father and children. I did what I thought was best and lead a course of action to bring the defendants here in the high court of federal jurisdiction under Section 1983 because the beforementioned has devastated human and civil rights as the defendants have affected the Police Dept as another suit will receive the prima facie long and lengthy show case, please consider,

Please, I beg and pray for considerations.



Matthew Escalante
733 Hemlock St
Gardner, KS 66030
Email eskie678@aol.com
Phone 913-286-2250
Fax no fax